

Please join me in supporting the "Francis X. McCloskey Post Office Building Designation Act."

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3379, a bill to designate the Bloomington, Indiana Post Office in honor of the late Congressman Frank McCloskey. Indiana has lost one of its most dedicated and valued public servants. Frank McCloskey's sincerity and compassion for people, not only here in America, but around the world, was profound. My thoughts and prayers are with his family during this time. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3379.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2559, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2559, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 429, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to House Resolution 429, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 4, 2003, at page H10253.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 2559, the fiscal year 2004 military construction appropriations conference report. This legislation provides funds for all types of construction projects on military installations here in the United States and abroad. These projects include family housing, barracks, training ranges, runways, aircraft hangars and fitness facilities.

I would in particular like to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), for all the great work that he has worked with me on, all the great activity. I also wanted to thank all members of the committee. Let me thank, in addition, the committee staff, including, and I am going to run down the list, Valerie Baldwin, Brian Potts, Kim Reath, Mary Arnold, Tom Forhan, John Conger, Jeff Onizuk and Lieutenant Commander Scott Gray for their support in producing this report. I would also like to sincerely thank Chairman YOUNG and the chief clerk Jim Dyer for their assistance in bringing this negotiation with the other body to a close. Further, I would like to acknowledge the advice and counsel provided by the House Committee on Armed Services. The bill is the culmination of a joint effort with subcommittee chairman HEFLEY and full committee chairman HUNTER.

The conference report today totals some \$9.316 billion which complies with the 302(b) allocation for budget authority and outlays. This recommendation is \$199 million more than the President's request. These additional funds address critical infrastructure and quality-of-life requirements above and beyond that request. Excluding funds provided for the global war on terrorism and the Iraq/Afghanistan supplementals, the conference report is nearly \$1.4 billion, or nearly 13 percent below fiscal year 2003 enacted levels. This year there were significant differences between the House's military construction bill and that of the other body. While we sought to preserve funding for military construction in Europe and Korea and to support the quality of life and operational readiness of our forces abroad, the other body chose to significantly reduce overseas funding to support projects here in the United States.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that this conference report strikes a balance between both these ap-

proaches. We preserve the most critical overseas requirements for the services, but brought the balance of the funding for other overseas projects back to the United States to fund critical infrastructure here. While the House aggressively supported the President's request and the priorities of the combatant commanders in this conference report, we share the concern of the other body about funding overseas projects in light of the ongoing review of our overseas footprint. The review currently being conducted by the Department of Defense will determine our long-term overseas basing strategy and will thus help us set funding requirements to support our forces abroad. It will be absolutely essential for both military construction subcommittees to have the completed plan prior to moving forward with the military construction appropriation for fiscal year 2005. We look forward to receiving this plan in the very near future.

Though this conference report is below the fiscal year 2003 enacted levels, we are fully supporting the military's mission critical infrastructure needs and quality-of-life initiatives. We are able to do so in large part because we are getting far more "bang for the buck" through innovative programs such as the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, barracks privatization and utilities privatization. These programs are enabling the services to rapidly replace family housing and infrastructure at a cost that is dramatically lower than what we could ever have afforded through traditional military construction appropriations. Our motto is to let the military do what they do best, which is defending America.

In short, we are doing it smarter, not harder, and the beneficiaries are single soldiers, military families, men and women serving our country around the world and the U.S. taxpayers. We have and will continue to support sweeping quality of life improvements for those in the military.

This conference report was forged through the compromise of both bodies of this Congress. This report directly supports the men and women in uniform, fully funds projects vital to our national security, provides critical infrastructure support to ongoing operations worldwide, and fully funds our efforts to improve the quality of life of our military personnel and their families. It is a fair report. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL - FY 2004 (H.R. 2559)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Military construction, Army.....	1,472,022	1,602,060	1,533,660	1,255,155	1,448,239	-23,783
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	211,688	---	---	---	---	-211,688
Subtotal.....	1,683,710	1,602,060	1,533,660	1,255,155	1,448,239	-235,471
Rescissions.....	-49,376	-66,050	-183,615	-183,615	-183,615	-134,239
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	2,000	---	---	---	---	-2,000
Total.....	1,636,334	1,536,010	1,350,045	1,071,540	1,264,624	-371,710
Military construction, Navy.....	1,095,698	1,147,537	1,211,077	1,195,659	1,238,458	+142,760
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	209,430	---	---	---	---	-209,430
Subtotal.....	1,305,128	1,147,537	1,211,077	1,195,659	1,238,458	-66,670
Rescissions.....	-1,340	-14,679	-39,322	-39,322	-45,622	-44,282
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	48,100	---	---	---	---	-48,100
Total.....	1,351,888	1,132,858	1,171,755	1,156,337	1,192,836	-159,052
Military construction, Air Force.....	891,650	830,671	896,136	1,056,377	1,067,751	+176,101
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	188,597	---	---	---	---	-188,597
Subtotal.....	1,080,247	830,671	896,136	1,056,377	1,067,751	-12,496
Rescission.....	-13,281	---	---	---	-23,000	-9,719
Rescission (P.L. 108-7).....	-18,600	---	---	---	---	+18,600
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	152,900	---	---	---	---	-152,900
Total.....	1,201,266	830,671	896,136	1,056,377	1,044,751	-156,515
Military construction, Defense-wide.....	836,345	695,298	813,613	712,567	773,471	-62,874
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	33,300	---	---	---	---	-33,300
Subtotal.....	869,645	695,298	813,613	712,567	773,471	-96,174
Rescission.....	-2,976	-997	-32,680	-32,680	-72,309	-69,333
Total.....	866,669	694,301	780,933	679,887	701,162	-165,507
Total, Active components.....	5,056,157	4,193,840	4,198,869	3,964,141	4,203,373	-852,784
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	241,377	168,298	208,033	304,085	311,592	+70,215
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	194,880	60,430	77,105	221,013	222,908	+28,028
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	8,933	---	---	---	---	-8,933
Total.....	203,813	60,430	77,105	221,013	222,908	+19,095
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	100,554	68,478	84,569	73,979	88,451	-12,103
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	67,804	28,032	38,992	34,742	45,498	-22,306
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	7,117	---	---	---	---	-7,117
Total.....	74,921	28,032	38,992	34,742	45,498	-29,423
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	63,650	44,312	56,212	57,426	62,032	-1,618
Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	3,576	---	---	---	---	-3,576
Subtotal.....	67,226	44,312	56,212	57,426	62,032	-5,194
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-7).....	18,600	---	---	---	---	-18,600
Total.....	85,826	44,312	56,212	57,426	62,032	-23,794
Total, Reserve components.....	706,491	369,550	464,911	691,245	730,481	+23,990
Total, Military construction.....	5,762,648	4,563,390	4,663,780	4,655,386	4,933,854	-828,794
Appropriations.....	(5,185,580)	(4,645,116)	(4,919,397)	(4,911,003)	(5,258,400)	(+72,820)
Defense emergency response fund.....	(662,641)	---	---	---	---	(-662,641)
Rescissions.....	(-85,573)	(-81,726)	(-255,617)	(-255,617)	(-324,546)	(-238,973)
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.....	167,200	169,300	169,300	169,300	169,300	+2,100
Rescission.....	---	---	---	---	-8,000	-8,000
Total.....	167,200	169,300	169,300	169,300	161,300	-5,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL - FY 2004 (H.R. 2559)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Family housing construction, Army.....	280,356	409,191	409,191	409,191	383,591	+103,235
Rescission.....	-4,920	-52,300	-52,300	-52,300	-94,151	-89,231
Total.....	275,436	356,891	356,891	356,891	289,440	+14,004
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army.....	1,106,007	1,043,026	1,043,026	1,043,026	1,033,026	-72,981
Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps....	376,468	184,193	184,193	184,193	184,193	-192,275
Rescission.....	-2,652	---	-3,585	-3,585	-40,508	-37,856
Total.....	373,816	184,193	180,608	180,608	143,685	-230,131
Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps.....	861,788	852,778	852,778	852,778	835,078	-26,710
Family housing construction, Air Force.....	684,824	657,065	657,065	657,065	657,065	-27,759
Rescission.....	-8,782	-19,347	-29,039	-29,039	-19,347	-10,565
Total.....	676,042	637,718	628,026	628,026	637,718	-38,324
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force... Defense emergency response fund (DERF).....	833,419 29,631	834,468 ---	826,074 ---	834,468 ---	816,074 ---	-17,345 -29,631
Subtotal.....	863,050	834,468	826,074	834,468	816,074	-46,976
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	1,800	---	---	---	---	-1,800
Total.....	864,850	834,468	826,074	834,468	816,074	-48,776
Family housing construction, Defense-wide.....	5,480	350	350	350	350	-5,130
Family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-wide	42,395	49,440	49,440	49,440	49,440	+7,045
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	2,000	300	300	300	300	-1,700
Rescission.....	---	---	---	---	-9,692	-9,692
Total.....	2,000	300	300	300	-9,392	-11,392
Total, Family housing.....	4,207,814	3,959,164	3,937,493	3,945,887	3,795,419	-412,395
Base realignment and closure account.....	561,138	370,427	370,427	370,427	370,427	-190,711
General provision (sec. 118).....	---	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	+55,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	10,698,800	9,117,281	9,196,000	9,196,000	9,316,000	-1,382,800
Appropriations.....	(10,108,455)	(9,270,654)	(9,536,541)	(9,536,541)	(9,812,244)	(-296,211)
Defense emergency response fund.....	(692,272)	---	---	---	---	(-692,272)
Rescissions.....	(-101,927)	(-153,373)	(-340,541)	(-340,541)	(-496,244)	(-394,317)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the committee. I just want to say again without Chairman YOUNG's support, we may still be slogging it out, but frankly rising to the occasion as he will and has done numerous times, he helped bring this thing to a closure.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I will be very brief. It is a good bill. There is more we could have done if we would have had more funds available, but we did not. But I wanted to say to the House that this was probably one of the most difficult conferences that we have had in a long, long time. I really rise to say congratulations and compliments to the strong leadership that the gentleman from Michigan provided during this very difficult period of time, and also the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member. They were strong supporters of the effort to preserve the position taken by the House which we thought was a much better position than that of the other body. These two gentlemen and the staff did an outstanding job. I just wanted to take a couple of minutes to compliment them because their leadership was extremely important to get us where we are today, to have this bill on the floor as a conference report.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. It does many good things for our service men and women, providing better housing, health care clinics, day care clinics, training facilities, not only here in the continental United States, in our 50 States, but throughout the world as well, wherever American troops might be training or serving their country. I want to especially compliment the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman, in his first term as the chairman of this important subcommittee, a committee that does work that makes such a difference in the quality of life for our service men and women to whom we know we can never repay our debt of gratitude to them.

□ 1445

At all times the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) put as his first priority what is best for the service men and women. He was fair. He was thorough. He fought hard for military families, our service men and women, as well as their families, and did a magnificent job in working with the other body and kind of working our way through a maze of very difficult issues; and I really salute the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) for his leadership along with his very fine staff. I also want to join with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman, in thanking the chairman of the full committee for his involvement and support in this effort to see that we not only fight for

quality of health care and training facilities for our troops here at home but that we also should not forget about the sacrifices made by our service men and women serving overseas that are thousands of miles away from their families, oftentimes in harm's way, risking their lives in duty to country; and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his many years of leadership in the area of national defense but particularly his deep personal commitment, aside from his title, his deep personal commitment to our service men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to send a message to the administration about this bill today. While the leadership of this committee did a tremendous job in making the most good out of a budget that was underfunded, I would remind the administration for next year that there is an old proverb, I believe it is a Chinese proverb, "Be careful what you ask for because you just might get it."

What happened is the administration, probably with a heavy hand from OMB, asked for a \$1.5 billion cut in military construction funding compared to last year. I think that is unconscionable to ask for a 14 percent cut in military quality-of-life and training programs at a time when so many American service men and women are at war and, yes, even risking their lives. Because of the good leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and his staff and our staff, we were able to take those inadequate funds and stretch them as far as anybody could stretch them. The RCI housing program, the Residential Community Initiative, is an example of trying to take a limited amount of dollars and stretch them a long way to improve quality of life in terms of housing for our service men and women.

But I hope the administration and the Pentagon and OMB are on notice. Do not play this game of sending to Capitol Hill what they know is an unfair, inadequate budget for military construction with the assumption that somehow magically we are going to find an extra \$1.5 billion. We did not find an extra \$1.5 billion. Had it totally been up to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and me, I think we would have somehow found that money; but that was above our pay grade, that decision on how much money we had to deal with. And I think as someone who has the privilege of representing 42,000 Army soldiers at Fort Hood in Texas, 17,000 of which are presently serving in Iraq, I think it sends a terrible message to them if next year we were to inadequately fund military construction once again.

So all of that having been said, not a word of it takes in any way anything from the tremendous leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and the bipartisan effort with which he led this effort. If anything, being given such an inadequate

funding request from the Pentagon and the administration and OMB, it even adds more respect from me to him for the leadership he showed to get this bill passed, as it will pass in just a few minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support for the conference report on H.R. 2559, the Military Construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. This Member would like to offer particular thanks to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), and the Ranking Minority Member on the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for their work on this important bill. Furthermore, this Member would like to thank the Chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Readiness, the very distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), and the Ranking Member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Readiness, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), for their critical work in authorizing this appropriation.

Furthermore, this Member is very appreciative that the Committee has approved the appropriations of \$3 million for the frontage levee segment protecting the Nebraska National Guard Camp at Ashland, Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska National Guard Camp Frontage Levee Segment is a central element of the Clear Creek portion of the Western Sarpy Levee project. Completion of the Guard camp segment must coincide with the other elements of the Western Sarpy project to assure mutual protection and support from the beginning of the project to its completion. Indeed, without building this section of the levee along the Platte River, the entire levee system will not work; there would be a gap in the levee that would only accentuate the flooding risks and flood volume that would affect the Nebraska National Guard Camp unless this project moves forward with the rest of the levee construction project.

Previously, the Clear Creek Project was authorized at \$15.6 million in the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (WRDA 2000) to provide protection to the City of Lincoln's water supply, I-80, and U.S. 6, BNSF RR (Amtrak Line), telecommunication lines and other public facilities. In the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill, Congress included \$500,000 for construction start-up costs.

The Nebraska National Guard Camp at Ashland, Nebraska, provides training for Nebraska and other States' Army guard units to maintain mission readiness. The Guard camp levee is an essential element of the Clear Creek structure on the western side of the Platte River since it also is that part of Clear Creek nearest to the Lincoln wellfield. Planning and design funds for the Guard's segment have been previously provided by the Congress to the Department of Defense through the Military Construction appropriations bill. Planning has resulted in development of a more cost-effective frontage levee to replace a previous ring-levee approach.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to vote in support of the conference report for H.R. 2559.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 76, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 430, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 76 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 108-84 is amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting "November 21, 2003".

SEC. 2. Section 8144(b) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107-248), as amended by Public Law 108-84, is further amended by striking "November 7, 2003" and inserting "November 21, 2003".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 76, just extends the date of the previous CR until November 21. There are no additional changes. It just continues the anomalies that were included in the previous continuing resolutions. So there is really not much to debate here except the date.

I would take just a minute and say that the House passed all of our bills in the summer, but the other body has not concluded all of its bills yet. But we are making some progress. This

morning we concluded the conference meeting and the conference report on the energy and water appropriations bill. In addition, we appointed conferees this morning in the House on the foreign operations appropriations bill. So there are three other bills presently in conference, labor-HHS, transportation-treasury; and as I said, foreign operations for which we appointed conferees this morning. There are still four bills that the Senate has not passed; but, Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that we can conclude those and get to the conferences and get the appropriations business for this year completed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a good time to try to analyze exactly why we are in the situation of having to again ask the House to pass yet another resolution keeping the government open until we finish our appropriations work. I note in the CongressDaily A.M. edition of this morning that there is a headline on page 12 which says: "Senate Nearing Halfway Point on fiscal 04 Appropriation Bills." I thought that when a race was run that it would be over when it was over. But the fiscal year ended on October 1 and what this headline indicates is that the other body had not yet even run half the race. So I concur with the gentleman that a lot of these bills are dragging because the Senate has not yet been able to take them up.

But I think we need a little bit more detailed description of what has happened. As I see it, there is one bill which is hung up, the Labor, Health and Human Services bill, which is hung up because there are deep divisions between the two parties in this Congress about how adequately education is funded in that bill, how adequately research is funded under NIH; and there is also, I think, a deep division between us on how workers ought to be treated with respect to their overtime rights. And because our party believes that the bill is woefully inadequate on all three of those counts, we have not supplied votes for it on this side of the Capitol and are still hoping that the majority will come to its senses in terms of recognizing the need to at least provide the money which was provided in the Republican Party budget resolution for education and for special education.

But once we get beyond the Labor, Health and Human Services bill, I find the story even more interesting. The other bill that was passed with deep divisions between the two parties in this House was the District of Columbia appropriation bill. That bill passed almost exclusively with Republican votes because the Republican majority saw fit to include the controversial issue of vouchers. So they went beyond where they could go and still maintain a bipartisan consensus for that bill and in the process lost the votes of most of the people on this side of the aisle.

In the other body, the other body has not yet even taken up that bill because not only Democrats, but I think moderate Republicans in that body, recognize that that bill was passed by the House in a shape too partisan or at least too ideological in order to be able to pass muster. So that is being held up for that reason.

Then we have the Energy and Water appropriations bill which passed both Houses with over 90 percent of the vote. In fact, the Senate vote was unanimous; and yet because of majority party scheduling decisions in the Senate, that bill was not considered until September 16 even though it passed the House on July 18. And I want to say that I am happy that finally today we have come to an agreement in conference. I think the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) did a good job on that. But, nonetheless, it was the majority party scheduling problems in the Senate which delayed consideration of this conference until this week.

Then we take a look at the Military Construction bill, the bill that was just disposed of. That bill passed unanimously in this House, and it passed by a vote of 91 to 0 in the Senate. It passed the Senate on July 11, and yet the bill was held up until today because of differences within the majority party about how the funds ought to be allocated. Then if we take a look at the Transportation bill, that bill passed the House very late in the cycle, September 9. It took that long to pass it because the subcommittee produced a product which not even the majority party Members in this House could support without substantial repair. Finally, after it was somewhat repaired, the bill passed the House with 85 percent of the votes of both parties; and yet it did not pass the other body until October 23, some 3 weeks after the deadline for the fiscal year.

□ 1500

So, again, majority problem scheduling problems determined the delay for that bill.

Then if you take a look the budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing, that bill passed with over 75 percent support in both parties when it passed the House. The other body has not yet taken up the bill. So, again, we have scheduling decisions by the majority party which have determined that this bill will be late to the gate.

I think there is an understandable reason for that, because the substance of the bill is unacceptable in large part to the veterans community in this country because it shortchanges needed veterans funding by more than \$1.3 billion. So I do not blame the majority party for being discombobulated because it is having a debate with itself about how it can correct that problem.

Then we have the Foreign Operations bill, which passed the House on July 24. It did not pass the Senate until October 30, 1 month after the expiration of